DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 332 CS 211 392

AUTHOR Chase, Nancy D.; And Others
TITLE Psychological Type as a Guide to Understanding Basic Writers' Responses to Literature. College Reading and Learning Assistance Technical Report 88-01.
INSTITUTION Georgia State Univ., Atlanta.
PUB DATE May 88
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *English Curriculum; Higher Education; High Risk Students; Personality Measures; *Psychological Characteristics; *Reader Response; Reading Research; Writing Evaluation; *Writing Improvement; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS *Basic Writers; *Response to Literature; Text Factors; Writing Achievement

ABSTRACT

A study examined basic writers' written responses to literature and looked for the effects of practice and personality on the development of these students' responses. Subjects, 24 students enrolled in a 4-week summer enrichment program for high risk students at a large Southeastern university. Students were asked to read and respond in writing about their "thoughts and reactions" to Langston Hughes' short story "T'ain't So." The students were also administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). Throughout the four-week duration of the program, the students were asked to read a series of short stories, to discuss them, to write responses to them and to share these written responses with fellow students. At the end of the program, students were asked to respond in writing to Gwendolyn Brook's "A Self-Solace." Responses to the stories were classified according to Purves' Response Preference Measure (developed in 1968) and analyzed for degree of focus. The Wilcoxin Matched Pairs Sign Test was used to analyze pre- and post-changes in written responses. Results showed trends found in pre- and post-written responses to text in this study supported the assumption that a response-oriented curriculum can effect change in students' reading and writing, suggesting that personality preference theory may offer an essential foundation for developing a curriculum that allows for the validation of individual differences within the context of shared language communities. (Twelve references are attached.) (RAE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297332

College Reading and Learning Assistance

Technical Report 88-01

Psychological Type As A Guide To Understanding Basic Writers' Responses To Literature

Nancy D. Chase
Division of Developmental Studies
Georgia State University
University Plaza
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Gwen Etter-Lewis
English Department
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49003

Cynthia R. Hynd
Division of Developmental Studies
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Northern Illinois University
and
Georgia State University

May 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Norman A. Stahl

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS211392

In recent years, researchers in the fields of composition and reading have been interested in studying students' written responses to text. The realization that writers must initially, and at varying stages of the writing process, be readers of text (their own as well as others), make student response to text a crucial activity in composition classrooms. With this realization comes the more comprehensive understanding that text and responses to them are guided, and assigned value according to shared characteristics of discourse or interpretive communities. In order, then, to comprehend or generate text in ways appreciated by a given community one must at least for the moment adopt what may be foreign or unfamiliar characteristics of such communities. In "Inventing the University," David Bartholomae speaks of the student's task in academic writing as "appropriating" the language of various academic communities:

> [Our students] must learn to try on a variety of voices and interpretive schemes--to write, for example, as a literary critic one day and an experimental psychologist the next, to work within fields where the rules governing the presentation of examples or the development of an argument are both distinct and, even to a professional, mysterious (4).

Such appropriation of disciplinary language in acts of reading and writing demand, according to Bartholomae, that students reach "some compromise between idiosyncracy, a personal history, and the requirements of convention, the history of a discipline" (5).

Our students' efforts at meeting the demands of academic discourse no doubt frequently involve great "compromise" between their personal or familiar language and ones that are less so. Whether, however, this negotiation involves forces as random as terms like "idiosyncracy" and "personal history" imply seems

questionable, yet poignant. If the classroom itself is viewed as an interpretive community, and the development of student response to text is the crux of curricular activity (readers becoming writers, writers functioning as readers/critics), then this issue of randomness and idiosyncracy indeed arises. Within each community (whether the sociology class or the developmental writing class) students will respond to text and shape language differently as individuals with cultural and psychological make-ups which temper the collective force of membership in a particular interpretive community. Consequently, how student progress is observed and evaluated in response-oriented classrooms remains perplexing. While inviting students to become active in the community, does the personal nature of response in such settings at the same time preclude assigning criteria for progress ? Are consistent patterns of growth discernable in classrooms where student response is emphasized ? How do we monitor the progress of this negotiation between personal, idiosyncratic language and the expectations of the academy ? Logically, it follows that if instruction is shifting from expecting students to simply detect and describe authorial or disciplinary intention in text to instruction that emphasizes the student's articulation of her own responses to text, and the subsequent generation of her text (thus active rather than passive participation in the academic community), then evaluation of written responses must also shift from stressing standardized and objective criteria for writing improvement to recognizing the frequently non-standard and individualized ways students grow as readers and writers through these responses.

But, non-standard and individualized need not mean idiosyncratic nor random. Teachers who have used response to text as a medium of interpretation in the classroom have observed that change in written response to text appears to take place over time, according to certain directions (McCormick, 1985; Salvatori,

1983; Sulkes, 1985; Smith, 1980; Bartholomae & Petrosky, 1986; Flynn, 1983; Petersen, 1982; Hynd, Chase, Stahl & Smith, 1986). Changes in response to text have been documented as following a pattern of development from initially personal responses to responses that incorporate broader issues and interpretations of text. Such change is believed to indicate a growing sophistication in reading and writing, or according to Salvatori, to reflect the student's developing awareness that writing about reading is not an "extraction" from a text, but is the "composing of oneself and the text through interaction with it" (664). Flynn, for instance, noted changes as students revised responses into essays. She observed that her high-risk post-secondary students at first responded to text in a highly personal manner. At the end of the quarter, however, the revisions of these responses appeared more global. That is, their revised responses went beyond their individual experiences to become responses that connected the text not only with the lives of the respondents, themselves, but with issues considered important in the larger academic community. Although many have made these observations about changes of response to text, there has been a general dearth of empirical research to validate them. Of equal, if not greater concern, is that these observations have limited use because they are not housed in any larger, applicable framework for understanding the commonalities and diversities of responding to text. Such observations offer insights, but no "tools" for practitioners. What seems lacking is both empirical evidence regarding the nature of changes over time in students' written responses to text and a vehicle for understanding what appears to be idiosyncratic, and thus insignificant differences in these responses.

Over a four week instructional period we examined basic writers' written responses to literature and looked for the effects of practice and personality on the development of these students' responses. We wanted to know how individual

patterns of change in written responses to text reflected the personality of the respondent. We hoped the examination of response changes, with consideration given to personality type of the student would reveal insights into the patterns of change in written response to text for individuals in classrooms structured as response communities; insights, in fact, that might suggest the use of psychological type as a vehicle for evaluating students' writing in response-oriented classrooms. Indeed, we found that changes evident in these students' responses to text could be viewed differently when personality type of the student was considered.

There were three areas of interest in this endeavor. First, we were interested in classifying response types using students' actual written responses. Response typing according to Purves and Rippere's (1968) Response Preference Measure was our vehicle for identifying changes of response type. Second, we wanted to see how practice in writing responses to text might cause students to change response types. Finally, we were interested in how personality variables such as introversion-extraversion and approaches to decision making might effect initial responses and change in responses to text.

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects of the study were 24 students enrolled in a four-week summer enrichment program for minority students at a large, southeastern university. The enrichment program was an annual offering for high-risk black students who expressed an interest in becoming acclimated to college course work. The program was offered in August and preceded their fall quarter enrollment as freshman in

developmental studies courses designed to prepare the students for college course work. Students would begin the freshman year in developmental studies taking courses in reading, English, and math. By definition, these students were basic readers and writers. All to often, as Jensen (1986) observed, such status simply labels students as all alike, i.e. inadequate. We felt such status on the contrary would provide a diversity of responses to text because these students, while being less accomplished in schooling, would therefore, be less bound to formulaic responses limited by years of "successfully" fulfilling teacher expectations. In other words, this population of students was especially appropriate for the study because of their lack of familiarity with conventions of higher education, and because of their similar cultural backgrounds.

Procedure

At the beginning of the four week instructional period, the students were asked to read and respond in writing to Langston Hughes' short story "T'ain't So". In this initial assessment, they were not allowed to discuss the story, but were asked only to write about their "thoughts and reactions".

Students were also administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). This instrument was derived from C.G. Jung's theory of psychological types, and has been used in counseling and research, including research on composition (Jensen & DiTiberio, 1984). The MBTI describes personality type, or preference, in terms of four bi-polar dimensions. The first dimension, Introversion-Extraversion, describes the way a person directs his/her energy. Extroverts focus their energy around people and things, i.e. external experience. Introverts focus their energy internally toward ideas. In contrast to extroverts who thrive on the immediacy of social contact and action, introverts thrive on the privacy

of contemplation and "mulling" before interacting.

While Extraversion-Introversion describe a person's focus of energy in the world, the Intuitive-Sensing dimension describes a person's way of perceiving the world. The intuitive type postulates patterns, searches for relationships among ideas and theories while the sensing type is data-driven, hesitant to explain without tangible evidence and is detail-oriented. The third dimension is thinking-feeling, which describes the way a person prefers to make decisions. A person whose preferred style is thinking make decisions on the basis of some previously thought out criteria, while a person whose preferred style is feeling approaches each new decision-making task on the basis of its unique, personal factors. The last dimension is the judging-perceiving dimension, which describes the way a person approaches task accomplishment. A judging person likes to put closure on tasks, sometimes at the expense of thoroughness, while a perceiving person would rather be thorough, sometimes at the expense of closure. Jensen and DiTiberio (1984) have used this instrument to analyze differences among student writers. Essentially they found that student personality type influences both the process and product of writing. For example, students who were intuitive types tended to write in general terms and to have difficulty providing support for their generalizations, while sensing types were more able to write detailed information but had difficulty making generalizations.

Throughout the four-week duration of the program, the students were asked to read a series of short stories, to discuss these stories, to write responses to the stories and related issues, and to share these written responses with fellow students. Thus, students were provided with opportunities to practice responding to literature and to develop a sense of community interpretation.

At the end of the four-week program, students were asked to respond in writing to Gwendolyn Brook's "A Self-Solace." This short story was chosen

because of its similarity to "T'aint't So", in length and content. They both describe attempts of Blacks to deal with the prejudice of a white woman. As in the initial assessment, students were not allowed to discuss the story and were told only to write about their "thoughts and reactions" to it.

Data Analysis

Response to the two short stories were classified according to Purves' Response Preference Measure (1968) which establishes four categories.

1. description - retelling of story
2. self-reference - identification with a character or event
3. evaluation - positive or negative statements regarding the quality, effectiveness of style, actions of character, or relevance/importance of message.
4. interpretation - explanations of actions or feelings and/or discussion of the significance of actions or feelings in the context of the story.

Each response was read simultaneously by the three researchers four times and rated as having a high, medium, or low content of each of the four response dimensions. The researchers collectively resolved any ambiguities. Examples of statements in each category are provided:

RESPONSE TYPES

DESCRIPTION: Retelling the story

"The old lady always said that she had some kind of pain."

SELF-REFERENCE Identification with a main character, relating events to personal experiences

"While reading this story, I became discouraged with Miss Cannon because she had no respect for others."

"The way Sonia Johnson handled herself in this situation was great. I would have acted the same way."

"One time something like this happened to me."

EVALUATION: Making positive or negative statements regarding overall quality, effectiveness of style, actions of character, or

relevance or importance of message

"I like the story because it was simple and straight forward."

"I loved the part where Miss Lucy Cannon went to see the faith healer."

"I think that until ideas of people change, there will always be prejudice in the world."

"I like a story that has a plot that you can focus on clearly."

INTERPRETATION: Explanations of actions or feelings and significance of actions or feelings in the context of the story

"This story is mainly concerning the word 'nigger' and how black people usually get ticked off when someone calls them that."

"It is ironic that Miss Cannon, who always hated blacks would one day turn to a black person for medical treatment."

Responses were also analyzed for degree of focus. If students included a generalization supported by details throughout the responses, or if they discussed only one aspect of the story that caught their attention, the responses were classified as focused. Otherwise, responses were classified as unfocused.

As for the Myers-Briggs scores, students were classified on only two dimensions--the introversion-extraversion dimension and the thinking-feeling dimension. We chose these two dimensions because there were somewhat even numbers of students in each group. Twelve students were found to be thinking types, eleven were feeling types, and one could not be determined. On the introversion-extraversion dimension, thirteen were extraverts, ten were introverts, and one could not be determined. As for the intuitive-sensing dimension, only two were intuitive and the others were sensing. The same results were found regarding the judging-perceiving dimension, with 20 classified as judging and four classified as perceiving. It is obvious that it would not be possible to make generalizations about response types of only two or four people.

RESULTS

Regarding written responses, it was found that, on the whole, students tended to make more evaluative and interpretive statements, and fewer descriptive and self-referenced statements at both pre and post test. Because of the non-parametric nature of the data, the Wilcoxin Matched Pairs Sign Test was used to analyze pre to post changes in written responses. This test is used to determine the significance of the direction of change, so that only changes in response style are analyzed. For instance, if 15 out of 24 students show a change from pre to post assessment from high to low along a response dimension, then the probability that these fifteen students would show an increase would be greater than .01. Hence, the change would be significant. The percent change for each response type is presented in Table 1:

Table 1

PERCENT OF SUBJECTS SHOWING RESPONSE TYPE CHANGE*

RESPONSE TYPE		INCREASE	DECREASE	NO CHANGE
DESCRIPTION	TOTAL	33	21	46
	CHANGE	61	38	
SELF-REFERENCE	TOTAL	46	21	33
	CHANGE	69	31	
EVALUATION	TOTAL	42***	13	45
	CHANGE	77	23	
INTERPRETATION	TOTAL	13	21	66
	CHANGE	38	62	
FOCUS	TOTAL	42**	17	41
	CHANGE	71	29	

*N = 24
**P< .10
***P< .05

In this table, the percent of the entire group is presented first, followed by the percent of only those students changed from pre to post test. In other words, students whose response style remained the same were not included in the bottom figures. As an example, while 33 percent of the total group made more descriptive statements at post test, 61 percent of the people who changed made more descriptive statements. As seen in this table, the only significant increase in the use of a particular response type occurred with evaluative statements. Of the 24 subjects, ten made more evaluative statements (42%), eleven showed no change (45%), and three made fewer evaluative statements (13%) at post test. Of the subjects who changed the degree of evaluative statements (n=13), 77% made more evaluative statements in their post responses (p=.046). There was a slight trend towards students becoming more focused in their responses, but this change was not significant.

When personality was taken into account, however, somewhat different results were found. As mentioned previously, only the introvert-extravert dimension and the thinking-feeling dimensions were analyzed. The percent change according to personality type is presented in Table 2:

Table 2
PERCENT OF SUBJECTS SHOWING RESPONSE TYPE CHANGE*

CHANGE ACCORDING TO PERSONALITY TYPE

		E/I	T/F	E/I	T/F	E/I	T/F
DESCRIPTION	TOTAL	25/33	25/36	12/27	17/27	63/40	58/37
	CHANGE	67/56	60/57	13/44	40/43		
SELF-REFERENCE	TOTAL	12/73***	42/56	25/07	25/09	63/20	33/35

	CHANGE	33/92	63/86	67/08	37/14		
	TOTAL	36/40	42/45	13/13	08/18		
EVALUATION						51/47	50/37
	CHANGE	75/75	83/71	25/25	17/29		
	TOTAL	00/20	13/12	38/13	27/12		
INTERPRETATION						62/67	60/76
	CHANGE	00/60	40/50	100/40	60/50		
	TOTAL	38/40*	42/37	27/07	00/27		
FOCUS						35/53	58/36
	CHANGE	60/86	100/57	40/14	00/43		

*P < .10
**P < .05
***P < .005

As in Table 1, the top numbers across each response dimension represent the percent for the entire group, and the bottom numbers represent the percentage for only those who changed their response type. Regarding introversion-extraversion, 73% of the introverts made more self-referencing statements at posttest than pretest, while only 7% made more at pretest and 20% showed no change. Of those who changed, 92% of the subjects became more self-referencing, which reflects a significant increase in the use of this type of response ($p < .005$). Of the extraverts, 63% showed no change, 25% made more self-reference statements at pretest and 12% made more self-reference statements at posttest. Extraverts, evidently, made no significant changes on this response dimension. Introverts' responses also became somewhat more focused at posttest, although the trend was not significant ($p = .062$). Of those showing changes in focus, 86% were more focused at posttest than at pretest. However, half of the introverts demonstrated no change in degree of focus between pre and post testing.

Regarding the thinking-feeling dimension, there was a trend for feeling types to use more self-referencing statements at posttest ($p = .062$), with 56% of those subjects making more self-references, 9% making fewer self-references and 35% showing

no change. Thinking types, however, became significantly more focused in responses at posttest ($p = .031$). Of the students who were not focused at pretest, 71% became focused at posttest. Only 50% of the feeling types showing change became more focused at posttest.

DISCUSSION

The first of three areas of interest proposed in this study concentrated upon the classification of response types using students' actual written responses. Because Flynn found that her high risk college students made more personal, idiosyncratic responses initially, we were expecting to find similar results even though her study dealt with changes as a result of revision and ours dealt with changes as a result of writing responses to different texts over time. In our study, however, students made more evaluative and interpretive statements, and fewer descriptive and self-referenced statements at both pre and post test. There is some problem, obviously, in comparing this study with the observations made by Flynn because we were using an adaptation of Purves' classification system. It could be argued, however, that self-reference could be considered a personal, idiosyncratic dimension, while evaluation and interpretation could be considered more critical/global dimensions.

The next concern was whether response preferences would change due to practice in writing responses. It was found that the subjects in this study became significantly more evaluative. Following the line of reasoning above, it could be stated that, overall, students became more critical, in that they were more willing to share opinions regarding overall quality, effectiveness and relevance of the author's message. It could be that sharing responses with each other as well as being offered chances to practice responding made the students in this study feel more comfortable with sharing their critical opinions in writing.

Although the trend towards all students becoming more focused in their responses was not statistically significant, our observations do suggest that students were

beginning to exhibit structural control over their writing at post test. Our failure to find statistical significance in this area may, in part, be due to our short duration of instructional time between pre and post tests.

The third area of concern in our study was whether personality variables would affect students' changes in response style. It is notable here that although a predominance of certain response types became evident in areas one and two of our investigation, we found few significant changes in students' written responses until response statements and focus were examined in terms of personality preferences (MBTI). The fact that significance in response changes were revealed when personality preferences were considered suggests that studies of response to text which do not examine personality characteristics of the respondent may risk overlooking patterns of growth in a student's written response, i.e. patterns that may be discernable in one personality type and not in another.

Our findings indicate that (1) introverts made more self-referencing statements at posttest and showed a trend towards becoming more focused, (2) feeling types demonstrated a trend towards making more self-referencing statements, and (3) thinking types became significantly more focused at posttest. In other words, students exhibiting certain personality traits made more statements in line with these traits after practice in responding to text. Introverts, who are considered to have their attention focused on their own internalized world became more likely at the end of the class to relate events in a story to their personal experiences or to identify with certain characters. Feeling types, who evaluate situations on the basis of individual merits and are considered to be more person-oriented than issue-oriented, also tended to identify with certain characters and relate events to themselves. Thinking types, who evaluate situation on the basis of previously thought out criteria, were more likely to focus on an issue found in the texts. Again, it could be said that sharing and practicing responses to text allowed students to become more comfortable in

sharing opinions, whether these opinions were critical, as found in the overall assessment, more personal, as found with introverts and feeling types, or more focused as found with thinking types. It is interesting to note that extraverts did not seem to change response type because of practice. Jensen and DiTiberio (1984) maintain that extraverts rely upon the verbalization of their ideas before and during writing for generating and developing their thoughts. Since our assessment methods omitted discussion of the stories before writing responses, extraverts were not allowed to exercise during assessment an approach to writing compatible with their preferred style, i.e., talking before writing.

Our findings suggest that the predicted pattern of change from idiosyncratic to more global textual responses may define the direction of growth for some, but not all basic writer/readers. In essence, the responses of our students changed over the instructional period in directions guided by their individual personality preferences, e.g., introverts' responses were more self-referenced and less global at the end of four weeks. In fact, in light of these findings, many of the implications for the instruction of writing proposed by Jensen and DiTiberio also appear plausible for developing and evaluating students' reading and writing through vis-à-vis responses to text. Although not new for the teaching of writing, these recommendations in the context of analyzing students' responses to text offer an alternative to the suggested pattern of growth from idiosyncratic to global responses in students' written responses to text.

The first of these recommendations applied to response analysis suggests that different personality types will display different strengths and weaknesses when responding to texts. For instance, as we have previously noted, thinking types may read with a critical eye for issues in the text, but may be less inclined to relate the text to personal experience than would feeling types. Second, less experienced readers and writers may respond to text according to their preferred personality style

exclusively, whereas a more sophisticated reader/writer may be able to engage the characteristics of his/her unpreferred style as well as preferred style, and thus may show more breadth and flexibility in his/her response. If this is so, developmental writers/readers may actually be a most desirable population to observe distinct differences in the characteristics of written response according to personality type. Furthermore, it is also logical that to encourage maturation in writing responses to text, teachers must allow students to write responses to texts and to share them in a non-punitive setting which acknowledges the strengths of all responses in the interpretive community of the classroom. Third, as Jensen and DiTiberio suggest, an awareness of personality preference can offer insights into how teachers evaluate student writing, and in this case, students' responses to text. A teacher who is a thinking type may value a response that criticizes the text and elaborates global issues raised by the text. At the same time, this teacher who has a preference for thinking styles, may place less value on the response that ties the text to a personal experience. Again, it is important for teachers in the classroom setting to recognize that differences of personality styles which become evident in students' responses can serve as potential avenues of insight within the interpretive community, and not as deviations to be scolded or rejected.

Trends found in pre and post written responses to text in this study supported the assumption that a response-oriented curriculum can effect change in students' reading and writing, suggesting that personality preference theory may offer an essential foundation for developing a curriculum that allows for the validation of individual differences within the context of shared language communities. In other words, personality type theory provides an alternative framework for evaluating writing improvement in response-oriented classrooms. We must not mistakenly assume that response methods lock students into a formulaic pattern of growth from highly personalize statements, to more expansive, analytical global statements, nor that such

a pattern would even be desirable. Personality typing accounted for much of the variety of response, in our study, and therefore, became a useful tool for observing the disparity, as well as, similarity of growth within the response oriented classroom. The "compromise" to which Bartholomae refers may be more accurately refocused as a negotiation between the expected strengths and weaknesses of personality preferences and academic demands.

By developing and validating these students' individual responses to literature, they grew in comfort and fluency in expressing personal feelings and opinions as well as critical statements about the stories. It is assumed that the clarification and validation of one's own reactions to texts, and the opportunity to express these according to preferred personality styles, are the necessary beginning stages of becoming active and critical readers and writers, who, by being clear and confident about their own interpretive style, will eventually understand and appreciate the interpretive styles of others.

References

Bartholomae, D. (1986). Inventing the University. Journal of Basic Writing, 5, 1, 4-23.

Bartholomae, D. and Petrosky, A. (1986). Facts, artifacts, and counterfacts: Theory and method for a reading and writing course. Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Briggs, K.C. and Myers, I.B. (1987). Myers - Briggs type indicator. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Flynn, E.A. (1983)). Composing responses to literature texts: A process approach. College Composition and Communication, 34, 342-348.

Hynd, C., Chase, N., Stahl, N., Smith, B. (1986). Reader response in the college developmental classroom. Thirty-fifth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Rochester, N.Y.: National Reading Conference.

Jensen, G.H. and DiTiberio, J.K. (1984). Personality and individual writing processing. College Composition and Communication, 35, 285-300.

McCormick, K. (1985). Theory in the reader: Bleich, Holland and beyond. College English, 47, 836-850.

Petersen, B. (1982). Writing about responses: A unified model of reading, interpretation, and composition. College English, 44, 459-68.

Purves, A.C. & Rippere, V. (1968). Elements of writing about a literary work: A study of responses to literature. Urbana, ILL.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Salvatori, M. (1983). Reading and writing a text: Correlations between reading and writing patterns. College English, 45, 657 -666.

Smith, E. (1980). The literature classroom as a community interpreters. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. Ed 240-599).

Sulkes, S. (1985). Two strategies for teaching literature to two-year college students. Teaching English in the Two Year College, 12, 105-107.

Master List
College Reading and Learning Assistance Technical Reports

Technical Report No.

84-01 Brozo, W.B., Schmelzer, R.V., & Spires, N.A. A Study of Test Wiseness Clues in College/University Teacher-Made Tests with Implications for Academic Assistance Centers. (ERIC No. ED 240-928)

84-02 Stahl, N.A., Brozo, W.G., & Henk, W.A. Evaluative Criteria for College Reading-Study Research. (ERIC No. ED 240-933)

84-03 Schmelzer, R.V., Brozo, W.G., & Stahl, N.A. Using a Learning Model to Integrate Study Skills into a Peer-Tutoring Program. (ERIC No. ED 256-244)

84-04 Brozo, W.G. & Stahl, N.A. Focusing on standards: A Checklist for Rating Competencies of College Reading Specialists. (ERIC No. ED 248-762)

84-05 Stahl, N.A., Brozo, W.G., & Gordon, B. The Professional Preparation of College Reading and Study Skills Specialists. (ERIC No. ED 248-761)

84-06 Stahl, N.A. & Brozo, W.G. Vocabulary Instruction in Georgia's Post-secondary Reading Programs. (ERIC No. ED 248-759)

84-07 King, J.R., Stahl, N.A., & Brozo, W.G. Integrating Study Skills and Orientation Courses. (ERIC No. ED 248-760)

84-08 Brozo, W.G. & Schmelzer, R.V. Faculty Perceptions of Student Behaviors: A Comparison of Two Universities. (Not Submitted to ERIC--See the Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 26, #3)

84-09 Henk, W.A., Stahl, N.A., & King, J.R. The Readability of State Drivers' Manual. (Not submitted to ERIC--please refer to Transportation Quarterly, 38(4), 507-520).

84-10 Stahl, N.A., Henk, W.A., & King, J.R. Are Drivers' Manuals Right for Reluctant Readers? (ERIC No. ED 245-208)

84-11 Stahl, N.A. & Henk, W.A. Teaching Students to Use Textbook-Study Systems (Not submitted to ERIC--please refer to Reading Horizons, 25 (3), 153-161).

85-01 Stahl, N.A., Hynd, C.R., & Henk, W.A. Avenues for Chronicling and Researching the History of College Reading and Study Skills Instruction. (ERIC No. ED 256-245)

85-02 Smith, B.D. & Elifson, J.M. Do Pictures Make a Difference in College Textbooks? (ERIC No. ED 256-246)

85-03 Brozo, W.G., Stahl, N.A., & Gordon, B. Training Effects of Summarizing, Item Writing, and Knowledge of Sources on Reading Test Performance. (ERIC No. ED 256-247)

85-04 Brozo, W.G. Teaching Students to Recognize and Manipulate Structures of Cohesion. (ERIC No. ED 256-248)

85-05 Henk, W.A. & Stahl, N.A. A Meta-Analysis of the Effect of Notetaking on Learning from Lecture. (ERIC No. ED 258-533)

85-06 King, J.R. & Stahl, N.A. Training and Evaluating Notetaking. (ERIC No. ED 263-537)

85-07 Chase, N.D. Reader Response Techniques for Teaching Secondary and Post-Secondary Reading. (ERIC No. ED 263-535)

85-08 Hynd, C.R. & Alvermann, D.E. The Role of Refutation Text in Overcoming Difficulty with Science Concepts. (ERIC No. ED 264-525)

85-09 Best, P.A. & Brozo, W.G. Current Research on Studying: A Qualitative Analysis. (ERIC No. ED 263-534)

85-10 Stahl, N.A., Henk, W.A., Brozo, W.G., & Sickele, M. Developing Independent Learners: Strategies and Tactics for Mastery of Text. (ERIC No. ED 263-536)

85-11 King, J.R., Stahl, N.A., & Brozo, W.G. Quality Assessments of Prospective Teachers: Surveys of Previous and Present Practices. (ERIC No. ED 266-133)

86-01 Hynd, C.R., Chase, N.D., Stahl, N.A., & Smith, B. Reader Response in the College Developmental Classroom. (ERIC No. ED 270-729)

86-02 Stahl, N.A. & Henk, W.A. Tracing the Roots of Textbook Study Systems: An Extended Historical Perspective. (ERIC No. ED 270-723)

86-03 Brozo, W.G. & Tomlinson, C.M. Literature: The Key to Lively Content Courses. (ERIC No. ED 271-720)

86-04 Brozo, W.G. & Johns, J.L. A Content Analysis of Forty Speed-Reading Books. (ERIC No. ED 270-724)

86-05 Hynd, C.R., Stahl, N.A., & Whitehead, E.H. Computers in the College Reading Program: A Basic Primer. (ERIC No. ED 269-753)

86-06 Singer, M. & Etter-Lewis, G. Personality Type and College Reading Comprehension. (ERIC No. ED 278-967)

86-07 Stahl, N.A., Brozo, W.G., & Simpson, M.L. Developing College Vocabulary: A Content Analysis of Instructional Materials. (ERIC No. ED 278-970)

86-08 Brozo, W.G. & Curtis, C.L. Coping Strategies of Four Successful Learning Disabled College Students: A Case Study Approach. (ERIC No. ED 281-149)

86-09 Stahl, P.C., Stahl, N.A., & Henk, W.A. Historical Roots, Rationales and Applications of Peer and Cross-Age Tutoring: A Basic Primer for Practitioners and Researchers. (ERIC No. ED 284-660)

87-01 Brozo, W.G. & Curtis, C.L. Unskilled College Readers' Comprehension of Connected and Disconnected Text. (ERIC No. ED 281-150)

87-02 Nist, S.L. Teaching Students to Annotate and Underline Text Effectively -- Guidelines and Procedures. (ERIC No. ED 281-155)

87-03 Stahl, N.A., Simpson, M.L., & Brozo, W.G. The Materials of College Reading Instruction: A Critical and Historical Perspective From 50 Years of Content Analysis Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. pending)

87-04 Simpson, M.L., Stahl, N.A., & Hayes, C. PORPE: A Comprehensive Study Strategy Utilizing Self-Assigned Writing (ERIC Document Reproduction No. pending)

87-05 Smith, B.D., Stahl, N.A., & Neel, J.H. The effect of Imagery Instruction on Vocabulary Development (ERIC Document Reproduction No. pending)